Bm
Misc.

FEB 9 1954

THE CHRISTIAN STRUGGLE FOR WORLD ORDER

by

WALTER W. VAN KIRK

Speech delivered before the Sixth National Assembly of United Church Women

Atlantic City, New Jersey, October 6, 1953

Christians are mandated by their risen Lord to be peacemakers. In obedience to his divine command they have enlisted in the struggle to save succeeding generations from the curse of war. They can do no other. The choice before them is a simple one. It is a choice between world order and international chaos. There is no other choice. And the hour is late. The earth shakes beneath the experimental explosion of atomic and hydrogen bombs. With feverish haste the Great Powers stockpile their lethal weapons of mass destruction. The gold and silver of nations large and small, are melted into cannon. Everywhere, on land, on sea, and in the air, there is heard the throbbing of the engines of war. Men are dying on the battlefields of Indo-China. There is an uneasy truce in Korea. The whole of Asia is in turmoil. Subject peoples chafe at their chains. There is bloodshed in Tunisia and Morocco. In the Middle East the Arabs hate the Israelis and the Israelis hate the Arabs. Germany is divided against itself. Behind the Iron Curtain hungry people cry for food. Millions of refugees trek their way over paths of want and desolation. There is economic unrest in France. There is political strife in Italy. There is rioting and rebellion deep in the heart of Africa. The power struggle between East and West poses a great danger for the human race.

But Christians are not in despair. They are not afraid. For 2,000 years Christians have been confronted with crises of one kind or another. They have sung their hallelujahs in the presence of tyrants and despots. Neither persecution, nor catacombs, nor crosses have silenced their witness to the things of peace. They are sustained in the knowledge that right is not forever on the scaffold; that wrong is not forever on the throne. They worship the God of history under whose governance all nations and peoples subsist. Dictators may rant and dema-

gogues may rave but Christians compose their souls in peace. They are determined to achieve a warless world. Should the consummation of that aim be denied them in the flesh, they will pass on to future generations the torch of this high purpose.

In this Assembly we are concerned among other things, with the responsibilities of American Christians in their struggle for world order. I shall discuss four of these concerns: 1, the United Nations; 2, negotiations between Russia and the West; 3, Point Four and surplus foods; and finally, faith versus fear.

To begin with, American Christians must stand by the United Nations. They wanted the United Nations and said so. When the Charter was signed, the Federal Council of Churches said: "We are grateful to God that the prayers of the Christian peoples of the world for the success of the San Francisco Conference have been answered with agreement to establish the United Nations."

That was eight years ago. Today the UN is under heavy attack. There is the unrepentant isolationist who never wanted the UN in the first place. There is the screaming nationalist who argues that the display of the United Nations flag is an insult to the Stars and Stripes. There is the puffed-up go-it-aloner who naively assumes that, as in the case of Joseph's brethren, the nations will bow down themselves before the United States with their faces to the earth. There is the fair-weather do-gooder whose fervor for the UN vanished when the going got tough. There is the academic perfectionist who is disgruntled because the UN has not, in eight short years, healed itself of all its ailments. There is the common garden variety of demagogue who is against everything save the sound and fury of his own demagoguery. Then there is the person who is sincerely and earnestly dedicated to the principles and practices of international co-operation but who feels that, the UN has somehow let him down.

The time has come, therefore, for Christians to reaffirm their support of the United Nations. Fortunately, we have in the White House, a convinced believer in the United Nations. The women of our churches should flood the White House with correspondence assuring the President of their prayers and informing him that in every test of political

strength with the isolationists in and out of Congress, their support will be with him and not with those who stand against him.

It would be impossible in the short time at my disposal to speak of the many activities of the United Nations that offer promise of a brighter tomorrow. It will suffice to refer to certain issues about which the people of our churches have a special concern at this precise moment. There is Korea. The day will come when the intervention of the UN in Korea will be seen to have been a turning point in the age-long quest for peace. No amount of upside down double talk can disguise the fact that in Korea unprovoked aggression was challenged by the world community. The burden of military operations was borne by too few of the Member States, a circumstance to which the United Nations must address itself as it looks to the future. Now that a truce is in effect the eyes of Christendom will be focused on the political conference which, it is hoped will soon to be convened. This conference must not become the occasion for a display of power politics by any nation or group of nations, East or West. Negotiations looking toward the establishment of a United Korea must be carried forward within the framework of the United Nations. Bilateral political deals have no place in a peace conference sponsored by the United Nations. The decision to resist agression in Korea was a UN decision. The conclusions reached in the forthcoming conference should be the conclusions of the United Nations, for the implementation of which the UN assumes full responsibility.

There is the reduction of armaments. The United States and other free nations must make another bold attempt to break the disarmament impasse. It is gratifying that President Eisenhower has so recently declared the willingness of our country to engage in a new and intensified study of ways and means to reach an agreement on the regulation and reduction of armaments. For Christians this is a "must." The present race in arms is economically suicidal, politically hazardous, and morally indefensible. As Christians we can never be content with a society that mobilizes its youth for military purposes, that teaches its children to crawl upon their stomachs in shelters and hideaways in anticipation of the day when atom and hydrogen bombs may fall upon their cities. We can never be content with a society in which

our treasured freedoms of speech and assembly and the spiritual integrity of our churches are jeopardized by the regimentation which is a by-product of a world armed to the teeth. If agreement on disarmament cannot be had with the Russians today, then let the search for an agreement be continued tomorrow, and next year, after that. To accept as inevitable a world precariously balanced on the swords and bayonets of nations in tension is to betray the solemn trust reposed in us by him who is the Savior of the world.

There is the raising of living standards. The efforts of the United Nations to improve the lot of the millions of people who live in the underdeveloped areas of the world must be continued and expanded on many fronts. It was the United States that encouraged the UN to embark upon a program of technical assistance. Imagine, therefore, the consternation of those people in whose lands irrigation projects are under way, and soil enrichment programs, and plans for the prevention of disease and epidemics, when they are told that the United States is drastically curtailing its participation in these creative endeavors. And this at a time when the Soviet Union and two Soviet satellites: Poland and Czechoslovakia, are making their mutual contributions to this program. For the Congress to cut the American appropriation to UN technical assistance by 25 per cent, is to do something that, in the long run, and from the standpoint of our own enlightened self-interest, is politically stupid.

There is the matter of human rights. Many of the people of our churches sincerely regret that our government is opposing "at this time" the ratification of Human Rights Covenants. Here again, our nation took the lead. The United States delegation was largely instrumental in securing the adoption of a Genocide Convention by the 1948 General Assembly. While a sufficient number of nations have ratified this Convention to bring it into effect as among the signatory powers, this treaty, which places the mass slaughter of humans under the ban of international law, still gathers dust in the archives of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. And now we are announcing to the whole world that the Covenants on Human Rights will not be submitted to the Senate for ratification. Considerations of practical politics may have suggested the necessity of a govern-

mental retreat on this important issue, but the churches will never lift the white flag of surrender on the front of human rights. In the struggle to establish in law the rights and duties of man. Christians have enlisted for the duration.

There are the refugees. Christians believe the refugee problem should be dealt with on a global basis. The National Council of Churches has asked for the creation of international machinery, under the UN, to deal with this world issue on a world level. We rejoice in the fact that the Congress has enacted legislation permitting the entrance into this country, during the next three years, of 214,000 nonquota refugees. It is to be hoped the United Church Women will co-operate in making available the jobs and assurances necessary to facilitate the resettlement of those refugees for whom the Protestant and Orthodox churches have a special measure of responsibility. But the refugee problem cannot adequately be dealt with by this or that nation in the form of emergency, short-time legislation. The task of rehabilitating and resettling millions of refugees is the moral and political responsibility of the entire world community. That is why the liquidation of the International Refugee Organization can only be viewed as a calamity. The UN should forthwith reconstitute the IRO and devise a strategy whereby these millions of refugees may recover for themselves a sense of dignity and human worth.

I have mentioned only a few of our Christian concerns respecting the United Nations. There are many others: the advancement of subject and dependent peoples toward self-government or independence, the further development of international law, the promotion of world trade, and progress toward the goals set forth by such Specialized Agencies as the World Health Organization and the Food and Agriculture Organizations. All of these concerns will be placed in peril if the UN is destroyed. And make no mistake about it. Powerful forces in this country are bent upon destroying the United Nations. The women of our churches must resist this trend toward international anarchy. I believe they will. Their record proves that they cannot be pushed around by the go-it-aloners. In the search for world order there is nothing comparable to the stubborn refusal of our church women to haul down the flag of the United Nations.

Not that the UN is a perfect organization. It isn't. The experience of the paat eight years has indicated the need of revising the Charter. The Senate has created a bipartisan Commission to make a study of Charter revision. There will be public hearings. It is not too soon for the churches to consider what they will want to say on this important question.

When it comes to #1 Charter revision, Christians must be prophetic as to the future and realistic as to the present. For example, the goal of world government is one toward which Christians should strive. The day may come when nation states will surrender many of their sovereign powers to an authoritative international body invested with substantial legislative and executive functions. But that time is not now. Any effort prematurely to transform the United Nations into a world federal government is to invite disaster. I do not believe that the General Assembly of the UN can, two years hence, be transformed into a World Legislature, or that the Security Council of the UN can at that time, be transformed into a World Executive. Let us, as Christians, review the Charter of the UN in the perspective of the ultimate goal of world government. But in doing this let us remember that you cannot slay the giant of unrestrained national sovereignty with pellets of paper pronouncements on world constitutionalism projected from the slingshot of ecclesiastical assemblies. The exercise of sovereign power by the nation state will be brought under the discipline of international law by the slow and painful process of experience, not by the affirmation of academic principles in the abstract.

Looking toward the immediate future it seems clear that the Charter of the United Nations should be revised in certain important respects. The use of the "veto" by the Great Powers should be modified. It may be too much to expect that the "veto" can or will be renounced respecting issues of political substance. It is almost certain that Russia will refuse to renounce the "veto" on questions of policy. Nor is there any evidence that the United States would be prepared to do this. But the "veto" can and should be abolished respecting procedural matters. It was never intended at San Francisco that the "veto" would be invoked solely for the purpose of hamstringing the UN in its procedural operations.

The General Assembly can and should be strengthened. Specific provisions should be

made in the Charter for the fullest possible implementation of the Uniting for Peace Resolution approved by the General Assembly in 1950. This Resolution included a provision for the convening of the General Assembly on twenty-four hours notice if the Security Council is prevented by the veto from exercising its responsibility for international peace and security; a provision investing the General Assembly with authority to make recommendations to member states for collective measures to restrain aggression; a recommendation that each member state maintain within its national armed forces elements that could promptly be made available for possible service as UN units; and the establishment of a Peace Observation Commission to observe and report in any area of international tension. Charter revisions that will thus magnify the creative role of the General Assembly will give us a better United Nations.

Charter specifications respecting the admission of new members should be clarified. Applications for membership in the UN have precipitated a tug-of-war between the West and the Soviet bloc. Consideration might well be given, in 1955, to revising the Charter in such a manner as to make automatic the admission of all nations willing to accept the obligations of membership. There should be created as an integral part of the Economic and Social Council an International Fund or a World Development Authority, to meet more adequately the tensions occasioned by mass poverty, illiteracy, hunger, and disease. These are among the proposals for Charter revision to which the people of our churches might well give their attention during the next two years.

I come now to the second of our concerns respecting world order. American Christians should support the processes of negotiation. This is no less important than Charter revision. Changes in the Charter will not, of themselves, guarantee the peace for which we pray. It is utter folly to assume that changes in the structure of international organization will lift Iron Curtains or resolve the tensions between the Soviet bloc and the free world. The nations, particularly the Great Powers, must be brought closer together by the process of negotiation on the highest possible level. It was not thought at San Francisco that the UN would undertake to settle the complex political issues related to the aftermath of the Second World War. It was

assumed that such issues as the future of Germany and Austria, and the role of Japan in Asia, would be settled by direct negotiation.

If we are to develop in this country a public opinion congenial to the process of negotiation, we must accept the view that we cannot always have our own way; that it is of the essence of diplomacy to find a middle ground upon which the negotiating nations may stand in fairness to themselves and with due regard for the interests of the world community. The search for this middle ground will be advanced when the statesmen of our own and other nations display a flexibility of mind sufficient to warrant diplomatic conversations.

The way to negotiate is to negotiate. When men in high places burst into public print with affirmations of policy from which it is said there can be no deviation save at the cost of national honor, they heighten the tensions by which the peace is imperilled and stultify in advance the process of negotiation. It must be conceded that to negotiate with the Russians is exceedingly difficult. But we must keep on trying, not in a mood of abject surrender but in the knowledge that posterity will bless us if we persevere in our efforts to reach an agreement with the Kremlin. It may well be that in the course of conversations around the conference table the United States may conclude that the only honorable course is to withdraw in the confident expectation that history would vindicate its refusal to compromise with truth and justice. That would be a commendable course of action and one wholly in accord with the highest standards of international morality. But the place for the United States to test the sincerity and good faith of those nations with which it desires to find common ground is in the conference chamber, not in the public press nor on the political rostrum.

As indicated by Secretary of State Dulles in his recent speech before the General Assembly, our country has declared its willingness to negotiate with the Russians, on the Foreign Ministers level, respecting the unification of Germany and the conclusion of a peace treaty with Austria. It was also made clear by Mr. Dulles that there are many other issues in dispute between the Soviet Union and the Western Powers concerning which we are ready, even eager, to negotiate. This is splendid. This declaration of purpose should be vigorously applauded by this Assembly.

Looking beyond conversations on the level of Foreign Ministers, or their deputies, we should be ready to support negotiations at the higher level of heads of state. President Eisenhower, in company with his trusted advisers, could be counted upon to carry forward such negotiations with credit to himself and with honor to his country. To shrink from top-level negotiations on the ground that the President of the United States would be sold a diplomatic "gold brick," or that he would be bamboozled by the forensics of Communist dialecticians is to display an inferiority complex that ill becomes our nation. Moreover, the effort now under way to limit the negotiating responsibilities of the President by a crippling Constitutional amendment such as that offered by Senator Bricker of Ohio, should be defeated.

In the third place, American Christians must support policies designed to relieve the hunger and deprivation upon which communism strives. They can do this in good conscience since their churches, in their own life and work, practice this gospel of Samaritan friendship. Emergency shipments to Europe and Asia of relief goods provided by American Protestant churches during the first eight months of 1953 were 72 per cent greater than in the same period of 1952. According to Church World Service, the minimum dollar value of food, clothing, medicine, and other supplies shipped so far this year, total nearly four million dollars.

But the churches and other voluntary agencies cannot do in this area of humanitarian endeavor all that must be done. The needs are too great; the resources too small. Here is a task for our own and other governments. The Technical Assistance Program of the United Nations, as already indicated, is a creative effort to lift standards of living on a global scale. In addition, the United States, in its Point Four program, and in its distribution of surplus foods, has launched an assault upon human needs which could meet, in part, the danger of further Communist infiltration.

The churches hailed the Point Four program as one of the most constructive efforts ever projected in the field of American foreign policy. They saw in this program essential elements of the Christian faith. They saw their nation preparing to share its material treasures, its skills, and its know-how to feed the hungry, clothe the naked, and provide shelter for the

homeless. When this program was first announced there was a great surge of hope in the dark places of the earth. Communist agitators were utterly confounded. They were not prepared to counter the strategy of a nation bent upon doing good. The churches supported the Point Four legislation. They recommended substantial appropriations by Congress to lift the Iron Curtain of hunger and deprivation. This they will continue to do, provided Point Four is not used as an instrument to buy Allies in the cold war. It must be clear by now that the United States cannot buy friends. In Iran, Point Four personnel is assailed. Burma has turned thumbs down on Point Four. So, too, has Syria. Elsewhere, as in Indonesia, Point Four is publicly attacked. Why? Because Point Four has become related to considerations of military strategy. The churches must do what they can to recover the essentially humanitarian spirit of this endeavor.

Similarly, the disposition abroad of our food surpluses should be dictated by humanitarian considerations, not for purposes of strategy in the game of power politics. The United States government owns outright more than two billion dollars worth of farm surplus; including 400 million bushels of wheat; 265 million pounds of butter; 925 million pounds of cottonseed oil; 20 million pounds of cheese; 26 million pounds of dried beans; and 374 million pounds of dried milk. These bulging storehouses of surplus food in the United States, by contrast with the empty stomachs of half the world's population, disturb the conscience of the American people. Happily, at the request of the White House, the Congress has authorized the President to spend 100 million dollars for food to be distributed to needy people abroad during the next seven months. Also, under the Mutual Security legislation, 250 million dollars is authorized for food to be sold abroad for local currencies.

The disposition of these food surpluses poses for the United States a crucial test of our national morality. If this food is made available on condition that the recipients, in one way or another, ally themselves with the West, the whole undertaking could boomerang to the discredit and hurt of the United States. If, on the other hand, these food surpluses are made available on the basis of human need, a vast reservoir of goodwill toward the United States

will be created. May God give our nation the wisdom and spiritual discernment to dispose of our surplus food as the Good Samaritan gave of his friendship on the Jericho Road.

Finally, and most importantly, American Christians must impart courage and confidence to the people of our land. There is danger that we may become a nation of psychopaths. Perhaps we need a Secretary of Psychotherapy in the President's Cabinet. It is almost unbelievable the extent to which the United States has become a vast whispering gallery of charges and counter-charges. Even the dead are dragged from their graves and their memories besmirched by the gossip-mongers. Patriotism is often equated with conformity. Loyalty is often construed to mean submission to political pressure. We are all agreed that if there are traitors in our midst they should be dealt with quickly and firmly. Those who conspire to subvert our institutions and destroy our government should be exposed and made to answer for their crimes. But surely these ends can be achieved without sowing the seeds of distrust and fear across our land. So pervasive is this fear psychosis that many of our people are uncertain about the present. They are in despair about the future. They feel they are caught between the upper millstone of Communist aggression, and the lower millstone of national bankruptcy and disaster. They no longer trust themselves. They no longer trust their leaders. They no longer trust their neighbors. They have all but lost their faith in the God of history. They run hither and thither like blind mice in a cage, believing themselves to be trapped by sinister forces beyond their control. To hear these people talk you would think the United States is undone, that the foundations of our Republic are crumbling, that the treasures of our civilization will shortly be reduced to dust and rubble.

Strange behavior, indeed, for a people whose forebears were men of faith. Our founding fathers had very little in the way of material wealth; no gold buried at Fort Knox, no storehouses bursting with surplus food, no tractors, no locomotives, no airplanes, no assembly lines, no copper mines, no oil wells. But they had faith in themselves. They had faith in the cause for which they were prepared both to live and to die. They had faith in Almighty God. They bequeathed to us and to free men everywhere a heritage that has been the inspiration of millions.

That faith seems to have departed from many of us. Otherwise we would not shake in our boots every time the men in the Kremlin snapped their fingers. It is positively degrading to observe with what consternation and dismay Western man, and free men everywhere, react to the fulminations of the Soviet dictators. One would suppose that our civilization was doomed, that the entire human race was foreordained to live in chains forged by the men of Moscow. It has even come about that to work for peace is regarded by the self-appointed custodians of our liberties as a form of Communist fellow-traveling. Thank God there are in this country hundreds of thousands of Christians, pastors and laymen and the devoted women of our churches, who pray for peace and who are determined, day in and day out, to work for peace. They are not going to be bullied into silence simply because the Communists mouth the dogma of peace to disguise their aggressions.

The fears which currently beset us have seriously compromised the moral position of the United States in the eyes of the whole world. No amount of highpowered propaganda abroad in support of our institutions of freedom and democracy will suffice as long as we on the home front exhibit a mood of alarm and frustration. Our government employs all the modern devices of mass communication to tell the people behind the Iron Curtain to be brave and strong. At the same time we ourselves act as though we were scared to death. That is why we are losing friends.

Let us be done with this nonsense. Let us recover that courage and daring by which our forebears won for our blessed Republic a place of honor among the nations. Let us as Christians, and as a nation, seek the guidance of Almighty God from whom there is derived the strength sufficient to overcome the forces bent upon our destruction.

Published for

General Department of
United Church Women

National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A.

by Central Department of Publication and Distribution

120 East 23rd Street, New York 10, N.Y.

F02-16
2191

Printed in the U.S.A.

Price: 10¢ each; $5.00 per hundred